



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,667	10/31/2001	Darryl Cynthia Moore	36968/262347	2447
7590 10/27/2004 Scott P. Zimmerman PLLC P.O. Box 3822 Cary, NC 27519			EXAMINER PARDO, THUY N	
			ART UNIT 2165	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/002,667

Applicant(s)

MOORE ET AL.

Examiner

Thuy Pardo

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's Amendment filed on September 08, 2004 in response to the Examiner's Office Action has been reviewed. Claims 1, 9, and 22 have been amended.
2. Claims 1-32 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Schneck et al.** (Hereinafter "Schneck") US Patent No. 6,208,986 in view of **Milo et al.** (Hereinafter "Milo") US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0004794.

As to claim 1, Schneck teaches the invention substantially as claimed, comprising:
a first reference to a first electronic directory, wherein said first electronic directory comprises a standard electronic directory format [LDAP directory, col. 2, lines 17-31], and

a second reference to a second electronic directory, wherein said second electronic directory comprises a non-standard electronic directory [directory in HTML via Internet or Intranet, col. 2, lines 19-22]; and

a searching component in communication with said database [col. 3, lines 48-50; col. 4, lines 35-46].

However, Schneck does not teach the database comprising a search order field, the search-order field determining an order in which the plurality of references are searched. Mito teaches the database comprising a search order field, the search-order field determining an order in which the plurality of references are searched [the information has been arranged in a hierarchy, 0013 of page 2-3; information is searched in the hierarchical order by the filed searcher, 0118 of page 9].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to add the feature of Milo to the system of Schneck as an essential means to retrieving references quickly and displaying them immediately to browsed efficiently.

As to claim 2, Schneck and Mito teach the invention substantially as claimed. Schneck further teaches a location of an electronic directory [col. 3, lines 65-67]; a format descriptor of said electronic directory [col. 7, lines 40-57]; and a search descriptor of said electronic directory [template tag, col. 7, lines 58 to col. 8, lines 7].

As to claim 3, Schneck and Mito teach the invention substantially as claimed. Schneck further teaches that said searching component comprises an executant on a web application server [col. 3, lines 55-65].

As to claim 4, Schneck and Mito teach the invention substantially as claimed. Schneck further teaches a directory entry display interface [col. 4, lines 19-22].

As to claim 5, Schneck and Mito teach the invention substantially as claimed. Schneck further teaches that a single executant comprises said searching component and said directory entry display interface [col. 3, lines 48 to col. 4, lines 24].

As to claim 6, Schneck and Mito teach the invention substantially as claimed. Schneck further teaches a query format converter [inherent in the system in order to data from a wide variety of data sources into a directory, col. 2, lines 8-11].

As to claim 7, Schneck and Mito teach the invention substantially as claimed. Schneck further teaches that said query format converter comprises a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) query string to lightweight directory access protocol (LDAP) query converter [col. 14, lines 12-45].

As to claim 8, Schneck and Mito teach the invention substantially as claimed. Schneck further teaches a display format converter [inherent in the system in order to illustrating the corresponding search request output, col. 14, lines 12-48].

As to claim 9, Schneck and Mito teach the invention substantially as claimed. Schneck further teaches performing a search of said electronic directory using said search criterion [col. 5, lines 29-31] and receiving a result of said search. [col. 14, lines 35-37].

As to claims 10-12, all limitations of these claims have been addressed in the analysis above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

As to claim 13, Schneck and Mito teach the invention substantially as claimed. Schneck further teaches accepting a selection of said result in said contact search user interface; and in response to said selection, creating an email message addressed to an email address associated with said selection [col. 1, lines 26-40].

As to claim 14, Schneck and Mito teach the invention substantially as claimed. Schneck further teaches that after the step of searching said database, the method further comprises finding a directory [col. 2, line 8-11].

As to claim 15, Schneck and Mito teach the invention substantially as claimed. Schneck further teaches searching for a directory of contacts and inserting a record corresponding to said directory in said database [col. 2, lines 1-16].

As to claim 16, Schneck and Mito teach the invention substantially as claimed. Schneck further teaches converting said search criterion into a format supported by said electronic directory [col. 2, lines 1-16].

As to claim 17, Schneck and Mito teach the invention substantially as claimed. Schneck further teaches billing for the use of said service [inherent in the system].

As to claim 18, Schneck and Mito teach the invention substantially as claimed. Schneck further teaches that said billing comprises billing a fixed amount per search [inherent in the system].

As to claim 19, Schneck and Mito teach the invention substantially as claimed. Schneck further teaches that said billing comprises billing a fixed amount per time period [inherent in the system].

As to claim 20, Schneck and Mito teach the invention substantially as claimed. Schneck further teaches that said search comprises a query selected from the group consisting of a

fragment-matching query; a whole-word-matching query; and an exact-match query [inherent in the system].

As to claim 21, Schneck and Mito teach the invention substantially as claimed. Schneck further teaches that said displaying further comprises filtering said result based on said search criterion [col. 5, lines 26-36; col. 14, lines 37-45].

As to claims 22-32, all limitations of these claims have been addressed in the analysis above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy Pardo, whose telephone number is (703) 305-1091. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (703) 305-3830.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows: (703) 872-9306 (Official Communication)

and/or:

(703) 746-5616 *(Use this Fax#, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "Draft" communication. Examiner may request that a formal/amendment be faxed directly to then on occasions).*

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

5. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or: (703) 308-5359, (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal
Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

October 04, 2004



THUY N. PARDO
PRIMARY EXAMINER